

## REMARKS

The Applicant herewith responds to the Office Communication mailed August 8, 2002. The Communication requires the Applicant to elect a single species and subspecies for prosecution. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Although the Applicant traverses the rejection, the Applicant elects to prosecute embodiments relating to Figures 1-5; namely, group I.a) and subspecies group II.a). In a telephone conversation between the Examiner and the undersigned on November 5, 2002, the Examiner indicated that Figure 5 could be included in the group I.a) as Figure 5 was inadvertently not included in the originally presented groups.

The Communication requests an identification of the claims relating to this election. The undersigned has reviewed the claims and believes that the following claims are related to this election: 27-42, 47-48, 51-54 and 64-70. It is noted that claims 27-29, 33-39, 47 and 64 are considered generic claims.

Further, during the telephone conversation with the Examiner, the undersigned became aware that the Examiner believed that the response was due within one month of the mailing date. The undersigned notes that no time limit was set for response for this Communication and attests that she believed that a six-month period was permitted as noted at the top of the document, wherein no extension of time fees were required until the fourth month. As such, no fees for extension of time are submitted herewith, and the undersigned does not believe that a petition for extension of time is necessary. If the undersigned is incorrect, the undersigned herewith petitions for an appropriate extension of time such that this submission will be considered timely filed. However, in light of the lack of notice of time limitations on the Communication, the undersigned respectfully requests a waiver of any fees due.

Finally, the Applicant requests amendment of the application to claim priority from Section 120/365 of Title 17. The Applicant asserts that this was omitted in error and in accordance with Section 120/365, the claim of priority is being asserted within the pendency of the application. As such, the Applicant respectfully requests amendment of the application to

Serial No. 09/689,957

reflect the additional priority claim.

The Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the claims be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Anna M. Vradenburgh

Reg. No. 39,868

Date: 11/7/02

AMV/

Enclosures: clean copy of amended/new claims

Brull Piccionelli Sarno Braun & Vradenburgh  
1925 Century Park East, Suite 2350  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
(310) 553-3375 x506 telephone  
(310) 553-4120 facsimile